

## REMARKS

### Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-33, 35, 37, 39-58, 60, 61, 63, and 65-68 are pending.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-33, 35-37, 39-58, 60, 61, 63, and 65-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-33, 35, 37, 40-58, 60, 61, 63, and 65-68 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 80, 81, 83-85, and 87-89 of copending Application No. 10/273,898.

### Summary of Applicants' Amendments

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 44 in order to expedite prosecution.

Applicants have amended claims 33 and 58 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regards as the invention.

Applicants have added new claims 69 and 70 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention.

### Applicants' Reply to the Examiner's Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

#### Claims 1 and 44

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Particularly, the Examiner stated "it is not understood how an image can be "'displayed in at least one or more of said one or more coin receivable apertures,' without the aperture being covered on one surface or side of the cover" (Office Action, page 3).

Solely to expedite prosecution, applicant has amended claims 1 and 44 to include an aperture not cut all the way through a cover (See aperture 18 of FIG. 2).

#### Claims 33 and 58

The Examiner rejected claims 33 and 58 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as "it is not understood how 'one or more apertures' can be located on an 'interior' side of at least one of the book covers if the 'apertures' are located on 'the exterior' of the book covers" (Office Action, page 3). Applicants have amended claims 33 and 58 to include additional interior-defined apertures that are separate from exterior-defined apertures.

#### Applicants' Reply to the Examiner's provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-6, 8, 10-33, 35, 37, 40-58, 60-63, and 65-68 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 80, 81, 83-85, and 87-89 of copending Application No. 10/273,898 (Attorney Docket No. HEH/002 CON). Application No. 10/273,898 is a continuation of the present application.


Application No. 10/273,898 has recently issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,969,091 on November 29, 2005. Accordingly, a Terminal Disclaimer in being submitted herewith with respect to U.S. Patent No. 6,969,091.

Conclusion

Applicants have demonstrated the claimed subject matter, including claims 1-6, 8, 10-33, 35, 37, 39-58, 60, 61, 63, and 65-70, is in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Jeffrey D. Mullen  
Registration No. 52,056  
Agent for Applicants  
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP  
ROPES & GRAY  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1104  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000